

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed August 21, 2007 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-27, 31-50 and 54-95 were pending in the application. Claims 25-27, 31-50 and 54-79 have been previously withdrawn, and claims 28-30 and 51-53 have been previously cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-24 and 80-95 are pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 1, 9, 17, 80 and 88 have been amended. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, are presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

**Prior Art Rejections**

In the Office Action, claims 1, 9, 17, 80 and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0086685 (“Wallentin”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0039237 (“Forslow”) in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0083876 (“Vialen”). Claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-24, 81-87 and 89-95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallentin in view of Forslow in view of Vialen in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0013443 (“Willars”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1, 9, 17, 80 and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallentin in view of Forslow in further view of Vialen.

Independent claim 1 recites a paging system wherein a **“paging command includes a flag indicating whether or not said core network has a capability to recognize whether an RRC connection is associated with said mobile station.”** (emphasis added) Similar language is recited in remaining independent claims 9, 17, 80 and 88. The combination of Wallentin, Forslow and Vialen fails to teach or suggest at least a flag as claimed in the independent claims.

Specifically, Wallentin does not teach or suggest a paging command that includes a flag indicating whether or not said core network has a capability to recognize whether an RRC connection is associated with said mobile station, as required by the invention as

claimed. The Examiner correctly asserts that Wallentin fails to teach or disclose a flag indicating a function of co-ordinating a packet service. See, page 3, lines 1-2 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that Wallentin also fails to teach a flag indicating whether or not said core network has a capability to recognize whether an RRC connection is associated with said mobile station, and also fails to teach or disclose a paging command that includes such a flag.

Forslow discloses that a packet header “specifies one of several general classes of service that indicates a transport by a circuit-switched bearer or a packet-switched bearer.” In other words, the packet header of Forslow includes an indication of whether the packet is transported by a circuit-switched bearer or a packet-switched bearer. (paragraph 0095) Accordingly, as the Examiner stated in the outstanding Office action, the packet header may indicate the presence of circuit and packet switched services. However, the packet header of Forslow does not indicate “whether or not said core network has a capability to recognize whether an RRC connection is associated with said mobile station,” as the claimed flag does. Furthermore, the indication disclosed in Forslow is not included in a paging command, whereas the flag of the invention as claimed is added to a paging command. Therefore, Forslow fails to teach or suggest the claimed paging command that includes “a flag indicating whether or not said core network has a capability to recognize whether an RRC connection is associated with said mobile station.”

Vialen also fails to teach or disclose a paging system wherein a “paging command includes a flag indicating whether or not said core network has a capability to recognize whether an RRC connection is associated with said mobile station.”

Thus, the combination of Wallentin, Forslow and Vialen fails to teach or disclose a paging system wherein a “paging command includes a flag indicating whether or not said core network has a capability to recognize whether an RRC connection is associated with said mobile station.” If this rejection is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where this feature is disclosed in either Wallentin, Forslow, or Vialen.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole. As mentioned above, Applicants believe that

the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-24, 81-87 and 89-95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallentin in view of Forslow in view of Vialen and in further view of Willars. As shown, neither Wallentin, Forslow or Vialen teach or suggest all of the features of the independent claim, specifically failing to teach or disclose a paging system wherein a "paging command includes a flag indicating whether or not said core network has a capability to recognize whether an RRC connection is associated with said mobile station," as claimed in the independent claims. Willars does not disclose those features found lacking in Wallentin, Forslow, and Vialen.

Specifically, Willars teaches a Universal Mobile Telecommunications (UMTS) Terrestrial Radio Access Network (UTRAN) that accommodates both circuit switched and packet switched connections (paragraph 0010). However, Willars also does not teach or suggest a paging command that includes a flag indicating whether or not said core network has a capability to recognize whether an RRC connection is associated with said mobile station. Thus, Willars, either alone or in combination with Wallentin, Forslow and Vialen, would also fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the independent claims. If this rejection is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where this feature is disclosed in either Wallentin, Forslow, Vialen or Willars.

Further, Willars fails to teach the features of the dependent claims. There is no teaching or suggestion in Willars of "means for performing said paging processing using said paging control channel (PCCH) if the connection status between said core network and said radio network controller is connectionless," or "means for performing said paging processing using said dedicated control channel (DCCH) if the connection status between said core network and said radio network controller is connection oriented." (dependent claims 2; analogous features found in dependent claims 10, 18, 81 and 89.) Willars fails to mention any action taken based upon the connection status or type of the network. Thus, Willars fails to teach all of the features of the dependent claims as well. Wallentin, Forslow and Vialen also fail to teach these features, and have correctly not been relied on by the Examiner to teach these features of the dependent claims. If this rejection is maintained, the Examiner is

respectfully requested to point out where these features are found in either Wallentin, Forslow, Vialen or Willars.

**Conclusion:**

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 19, 2008

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6014  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By George C. Beck

George C. Beck  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,072

Ramya Ananthanarayanan  
Agent for Applicant  
Registration No. 59,597